



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/804,268	03/13/2001	Makoto Muraishi	826.1697/JDH	9108
21171	7590	04/20/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			CHUONG, TRUC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/804,268		MURAISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Truc T Chuong		2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 12/17/04.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10-17 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 1, and 10-14 are amended, claims 15-17 are new claims. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "and" opens for indefinite number of limitations to be included.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Anodide et al. (EP 0 869 433 A2).

Art Unit: 2179

As to claims 1 and 14, Anodide teaches a test support apparatus for supporting a test of a screen program using a graphic user interface, comprising:

a test support class generation unit (TDE, e.g., col. 3 lines 27-42, figs. 6-7) obtaining screen definition information (capture basic information about the GUI software, col. 4 lines 36-38, and col. 5 lines 46-47) defining a test target screen program (defining what kind of GUI software (SUT) to be tested based on information about that GUI software, col. 4 lines 4-18, and lines 36-50), and generating a test support class which is a subclass inheriting a class of the test target screen program responsive to the screen definition information, and a class for testing the test target screen program (capturing/calling information from the SUT to determine possible variations of the GUI operations and input data, TDE will automatically generate a testing module for testing the SUT, col. 4 lines 4-18, lines 36-50, and col. 8 lines 13-18);

a test execution unit conducting a test of the test target screen program defined by the screen definition information using the generated test support class to thereby test the screen program using the graphical user interface (e.g., col. 5 lines 9-18, col. 5 lines 34-40, and figs. 6-7); and

wherein the screen definition information comprises a class name of a parent of the test target screen program and the test support class is generated as a child class by inheriting the parent class (Anodide shows in fig. 7 that the Test Manager 1 having the class names of the test target such as: Test.1, ReplaceTrace, EditTrace, etc. and the Test Manager will generate the Test Group in the same names (Test Group: ReplaceTrace or Test Group: Test. 1) with the parent class (see 2 and 4 of fig. 7)); Assumedly, if Anodide does not clearly show that generating the child class by inheriting the parent class as claimed, it is well known and would have been

Art Unit: 2179

obvious at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to be able to share or inherit the existing/parent class to keep consistency and to limit the confusion when too many different class names used during developing/testing process.

As to claim 2, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a test specification generation unit generating a test specification for the test target screen program according to the screen definition information, and providing the test specification for said test execution unit (input specification/parameters, col. 4 lines 43-45, col. 8 lines 37-39, and col. 13 lines 4-9).

As to claim 3, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising:
a test report generation unit generating a test report using the test specification generated by said test specification generation unit and a test execution result obtained by said test execution unit (e.g., TDE provides a set of basic coverage reporting structures, col. 13 line 42-col. 14 line 13, and fig. 9).

As to claim 4, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said test support class has a function of supporting input of input test data (e.g., col. 13 lines 3-10).

As to claim 5, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of recording a test result obtained when a test is conducted (coverage reports, col. 13 line 42-col. 14 line 13, and fig. 9).

As to claim 6, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of visually indicating a test execution portion on a screen (TDE uses capture/replay tools which permit the tester to record and playback the action on the interface, col. 1 line 57-col. 2 line 13).

As to claim 7, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of conducting a test using new input test data or input data about a previous test execution result (any of the symbols and different elements can be inserted in to the test, col. 12 lines 48-49, col. 13 lines 3-10, and col. 14 lines 29-35).

As to claim 8, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 7, wherein said test support class has a function of displaying a actual result(s) to perform comparisons (col. 15 lines 26-36) when an execution result of a test conducted using the input data about the previous test execution result is different from the previous test execution result. The actual test result(s) itself is a warning display for comparing the testing results because Anodide's system performs the output validation when comparing the expecting results and previous results (col. 15 lines 26-36); therefore, some type of indications in the test result(s) must be provided to the tester for recognition; and if the indication is not a warning message, it is well known and would have been obvious to modify the test result(s) of Anodide to display the warning indications to visualize errors during testing.

As to claim 9, Anodide teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of supporting measurement of performance of the test target screen program (Coverage Summary of fig. 9).

As to claim 10, this is a method claim of the apparatus claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 11, this is a computer program product claim of the apparatus claim 1. Note the rejections of claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2179

As to claim 12, this is a computer program product claim of the apparatus claims 1 and 4.

Note the rejections of claims 1 and 4 above.

As to claim 13, this is a system claim of the apparatus claims 1 and 4. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 4 above.

As to claim 15, Anodide teaches a test method, comprising:

using a screen definition to produce a test program for a screen program that interacts with a graphical user interface where the screen definition comprises a class name of a parent of the screen program and the test program is generated as a child class by inheriting a parent class (note the rejection of claim 1 above); and

testing the screen program and interface using the test program selected responsive to the screen definition (capturing/calling information from the SUT to determine possible variations of the GUI operations and input data, TDE will automatically generate a testing module for testing the SUT, col. 4 lines 4-18, lines 36-50, and col. 8 lines 13-18).

As to claim 16, Anodide teaches a test method, comprising:

using a screen definition to produce a test program for a screen program that interacts with a graphical user interface where the screen definition comprises a class name of a parent of the screen program and the test program is generated as a child class by inheriting a parent class (note the rejection of claim 1 above);

generating a test specification for the test target screen program responsive to the screen definition information (input specification/parameters, col. 4 lines 43-45, col. 8 lines 37-39, and col. 13 lines 4-9); and

Art Unit: 2179

testing the screen program and interface using the test program selected and test specification generated responsive to the screen definition (capturing/calling information from the SUT to determine possible variations of the GUI operations and input data, TDE will automatically generate a testing module for testing the SUT, col. 4 lines 4-18, lines 36-50, and col. 8 lines 13-18).

As to claim 17, Anodide teaches a test method, comprising:

using a screen definition to produce a test program for a screen program that interacts with a graphical user interface where the screen definition comprises a class name of a parent of the screen program and the test program is generated as a child class by inheriting a parent class;

generating a test specification for the test target screen program responsive to the screen definition information (input specification/parameters, col. 4 lines 43-45, col. 8 lines 37-39, and col. 13 lines 4-9);

testing the screen program and interface using the test program selected and test specification generated responsive to the screen definition (capturing/calling information from the SUT to determine possible variations of the GUI operations and input data, TDE will automatically generate a testing module for testing the SUT, col. 4 lines 4-18, lines 36-50, and col. 8 lines 13-18); and

generating a test report using the test specification and a test execution result produced by the testing (e.g., TDE provides a set of basic coverage reporting structures, col. 13 line 42-col. 14 line 13, and fig. 9).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued and Examiner disagrees for the following reason:

a. Anodide does not provide the screen definition information comprises a class name of a parent of the test target screen program and the test support class is generated as a child class by inheriting the parent class.

Anodide shows in fig. 7 that the Test Manager 1 having the class names of the test target such as: Test.1, ReplaceTrace, EditTrace, etc. and the Test Manager will generate the Test Group in the same names (Test Group: ReplaceTrace or Test Group: Test. 1) with the parent class (see 2 and 4 of fig. 7).

b. Anodide does not discuss of using screen definition information to automatically select, generate or produce a test program for testing a screen program that interacts with an interface.

Anodide teaches of capturing/calling information from the SUT to determine possible variations of the GUI operations and input data, TDE will automatically generate a testing module for testing the SUT (col. 4 lines 4-18, lines 36-50, and col. 8 lines 13-18).

c. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests the system to use a previous test execution result as an input.

Claim language recited "the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of conducting a test using new input test data or input data

Art Unit: 2179

about a previous test execution result.” Therefore, either one of the limitations is considered when interpreting/rejecting the claim.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

04/17/05


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER